

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24 have been amended by the present Amendment. Amended claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24 do not introduce any new subject matter.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,122,279 ("Milway") in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0051450 ("Ganesh").

The Examiner admits that Milway fails to teach a plurality of tables, each of which corresponds to one output port of a plurality of output ports, and relies on Ganesh to cure the deficiency in Milway.

However, in contrast to the claimed embodiments, Ganesh fails to teach that the one output port to which each respective table corresponds is the only destination port for that table, as essentially recited in amended claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24.

For example, referring to Fig. 6 of Applicant's disclosure, the destination port for all of the identifiers in lookup table 60 is output port 20, the destination port for all of the identifiers in lookup table 61 is output port 21, the destination port for all of the identifiers in lookup table 62 is output port 22, and the destination port for all of the identifiers in lookup table 63 is output port 23. "Therefore, an identifier applied to the switching apparatus through an input port can be searched for in lookup tables of all output ports simultaneously, so that the time taken to search for a destination is substantially reduced" and "[u]se of such lookup tables reduces a load for a destination decision, allowing use of a lower speed memory when compared with conventional switching apparatuses." See, e.g., Applicant's disclosure, page 10, line 23 – page 11,

line 9.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, while each port in Ganesh is shown as having its own lookup table, the lookup tables for each port (e.g., tables 40 and 49) provide a number of different destination ports depending on the network address. See Ganesh, Fig. 2. For example, although lookup table 49 corresponds to port N, and not to port 6, it links Addr. 9 with destination port 6 “because it recently forwarded a network frame containing Addr. 9 to port 6.” See Ganesh, para. [0021]. Accordingly, unlike the claimed embodiments, Ganesh fails to disclose or suggest that the one output port to which each respective table corresponds is the only destination port for that table.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24 are patentable over Milway in view of Ganesh. For at least the reason that claims 2-10 depend from claim 1, claims 12-20 depend from claim 11, and claim 22 depends from claim 21, claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited references.

As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicants' Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael F. Morano", written over a horizontal line.

Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888